

Commissioner's Secretary, Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554

To the Federal Communications Commission,

The FCC Policy Statement on Network Neutrality perfectly stresses the importance of the Internet in America and how its widespread use has had a profound impact on the country as we know it today. One can obtain vast amounts of research and data in a relatively short amount of time, and communication between individuals through closed and open forums can be completed in mere seconds. Some take the effectiveness and ease of use of the Internet for granted while others see the unparalleled importance of such an infrastructure. I believe the Federal Communications Commission and the United States Government are responsible for preserving the openness of the Internet by enforcing "network neutrality" through opposing the Verizon-Google Legislative Framework Proposal, preventing paid prioritization of certain content, and working with Congress to allow the Federal Communications Commission to regulate network neutrality to keep the Internet open as it is today.

In early August of 2010, Communications conglomerates Verizon and Google published a joint policy proposal, or framework for the future of the Internet. The document outlines seven principles the companies claim will "preserve the open Internet and the vibrant and innovative markets it supports." It is clear that the document promotes the openness of the internet through wired broadband networks, but unfortunately these companies do not feel the wireless broadband spectrum should be enforced in the same manner. As technology advances, it is clear that wireless is the wave of the future. Two huge stakeholders in the wireless industry are in fact, Verizon and Google. Through this proposal it's evident that Verizon wants to control which content and at what speeds we are able to access such content. In this situation, I believe the interests of the common American citizen need to be accounted for, not the interests of various corporations whose sole interests are profiting from American citizens. I strongly oppose such a framework, and I believe it would be giving the major corporations the upper hand. This framework can quickly fill the wireless industry with unfair yet legal practices, forcing Americans to pay premiums for the relatively constant connection speeds that are standard today.

Like millions of Americans, one of the first things I do in the morning is turn on the computer and check for important emails from family members or professors. Once I finish with the important things, I tend to peruse through various news websites to keep up with politics, local news, music, and anything else that interests me on a given day. What's great about the current status of the web is the fact that most websites load at about the same speed, which is predominantly dependent on the Internet connection speed of my Internet Service Provider, CNS of Ohio University. With the future of the way we access websites uncertain, this consistent speed that is based on our ISP is at risk. Large companies may be willing to prioritize their content, and Service Provider AT&T is a supporter of this

paid prioritization. In some aspects, this may be great for consumers looking to stream a television show or movie from the web, as large companies can afford to prioritize their content. YouTube and Fox, for example, would certainly have the funds to give their customers plenty of bandwidth to view their content in High Definition. Where this paid prioritizing falls short of being ideal for Americans is the fact that many independent or small voices can essentially be silenced if they don't have the funds to prioritize their content. I firmly believe the FCC and US Government must prevent interest groups like AT&T, Verizon, and Google from getting their way through lobbying for jointly proposed frameworks, which include loophole phrases such as "Reasonable Network Management" and "Managed Services". These phrases can easily be construed, providing corporations with ways to get away with paid prioritization of content.

As Federal Communications Commission Chairman Julius Genachowski warned in a speech at the Brookings Institution, Network Neutrality is vital, and "We could see the Internet's doors shut to entrepreneurs, the spirit of innovation stifled, a full and free flow of information compromised." It is very possible that this could be the future of the Internet, so please take these comments into consideration. I feel it is extremely important that the Federal Communications Commission works with United States Congress in order to prevent large interest groups from swaying legislation on such an important facet of American life.

The Federal Communications Commission and the United States Government has a huge responsibility to preserve the openness of the Internet through Network Neutrality. I believe proposed frameworks by Verizon and Google and paid prioritization of websites must be opposed, while the FCC and Congress work together to resolve the current issues the Internet is facing. I feel as though the preservation of net neutrality is one of the defining issues of my generation, and actions need to be taken to prevent corporate superpowers from placing a deceptive stronghold on their tactics in order to charge what they want, and drown out the minority. I hope that my thoughts and opinions are taken into consideration when moving forth in Internet related legislation, and I thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kyle Garchar
186 Mill St. Apt 203
Athens, OH 45701